

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12 and 14-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12 and 14-16, 18, 21-23, 25-27, 29, and 32-46 are currently rejected. Claims 3, 17, 19, 20, 28, 30 and 31 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but are considered allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 24 is allowable.

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12 and 14-16, 18, 21-23, 25-27, 29, and 32-46 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 17, 19, 20, 28, 30 and 31 have been rewritten to overcome the Examiner's objections. In light of the amendments and remarks herein, reconsideration of claims 3, 17, 19, 20, 24, 28, 30 and 31 is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Claims

While Applicants believe that the previously presented claims are patentable over all of the art cited in the Office Action as well as all other references submitted by Applicants, the claims have nonetheless been amended as follows in order to place the application in condition for allowance of the claims. The Applicants traverse the Examiner's stated basis for rejecting the now-cancelled claims. The amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original scope of the claims as provided prior to the cancellation or amendments, such as through continuation practice.

Claims 3, 17, 19, 20, 28, 30 and 31 are amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Objections to the Drawings and Claim Rejections under U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner objected to the drawings to the extent that they failed to show claim elements related to bristles and bodies conformable to an oral cavity. The examiner also rejected claims 22 and 34-40 for containing subject matter that was not described in the specification. The Applicants traverse the Examiner's stated bases for the objection to the drawings and the rejection of the claims, including the statement that "an embodiment with bristles and a body that

conforms to an oral cavity is new matter.” However, to place the Application in order for allowance, the Applicant’s have cancelled claims 22 and 34-40.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

As noted above, the Applicants disagree with and traverse the Examiner’s stated basis for rejecting the claims pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, including for the reasons stated in the Applicant’s prior response to the Examiner’s Office Action dated May 24, 2006. However, the Applicants appreciate and acknowledge the Examiner’s indication that the Application contains allowable subject matter. Therefore, to place the Application in order for allowance, the Applicant’s have cancelled the rejected claims.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration is respectfully requested for all the reasons set forth above. In the event that the Examiner deems that the amendments and remarks do not overcome the stated grounds for rejection or objection, the Applicants kindly request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

NUTTER McCLENNEN & FISH LLP

Date: July 23, 2007

By Electronic Signature: /Reza Mollaaghababa/

Reza Mollaaghababa
Registration No.: 43,810
Attorney for Applicants
World Trade Center West
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210-2604
(617) 439-2514
(617) 310-9514 (Fax)